

App. No. 10/634,189
Attorney Docket 3023.2.1 CIP

Amendments to the Drawings

None

App. No. 10/634,189
Attorney Docket 3023.2.1 CIP

Remarks

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Written Office Action. In particular, the Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for consideration of the new claims. Further, the Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the information provided in regard to claiming the benefit of a previously filed application.

With regards the substantive portion of the Written Office Action, Claims 10 and 11 were rejected and Claims 13 – 21 were objected to. Further, the benefit claim filed on November 15, 2004 was not entered.

In particular, Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Poston as set forth in the previous rejection. Also, Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poston in view of Kent as applied in the previous rejection. Claims 13 – 21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 14, and 19 are amended. Claims 22 – 29 are new. In particular, Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 10, 11, and 19. Claim 13 has been amended to be an independent claim including the limitations of Claims 10 and 13. Claim 14 has been amended to be an independent claim including the limitations of Claims 10 and 18. Claim 19 is amended to depend from Claim 14 instead of Claim 11. Claims 22 – 29 contain subject matter found in Claims 19 and 20, and therefore are not believed to be new matter.


Further, Applicant notes that the Attorney Docket Number for the present Application is not correct as recorded by the United States Patent Office. The correct

App. No. 10/634,189
Attorney Docket 3023.2.1 CIP

Attorney Docket Number is "3023.2.1 CIP" not "3023.2.6." Applicant respectfully requests that the correct Attorney Docket Number be used in future correspondence.

For these reasons, it is believed that none of the prior art teaches the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is believed that the foregoing amendment has adequate support in the specification, and accordingly there should be no new matter. Applicant believes the pending claims have addressed each of the issues pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action. In light of the foregoing amendment, the claims should be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the proposed changes, Applicant again invites the Examiner to do so by telephone conference.

Respectfully Submitted,


Jason P. Webb
Registration No. 55,714
Attorney for Applicant

Date: May 10, 2005

Starkweather and Associates
9035 South 1300 East
Suite 200
Sandy, Utah 84094
Telephone: 801/272-8368